

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON**

MIAMI VALLEY FAIR HOUSING  
CENTER, INC., *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

-vs-

STEINER & ASSOCIATES, INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

:

:

:

:

:

:

Case No. 3:08-cv-150

District Judge Thomas M. Rose

Magistrate Judge Michael J. Newman

---

**ORDER**

---

This matter is before the undersigned following the issuance of a remand from the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. *Miami Valley Fair Hous. Ctr., Inc. v. Steiner & Assocs.*, No. 10-4191, 2012 U.S. App. LEXIS 10316 (6th Cir. May 18, 2012). As the Sixth Circuit noted, “[s]everal Third-Party Defendants . . . moved to dismiss the third-party complaint on the ground that the district court lacked personal jurisdiction over them, on the grounds that neither federal law nor the Ohio long-arm statute permitted service of process over those Third-Party Defendants.” *Id.* at \*8. The case was remanded to consider this jurisdictional issue. *Id.* at \*8-10.

Having fully considered this issue, the Court **ORDERS** as follows:

1. The Third-Party Defendants who previously filed motions to dismiss -- premised, in whole or part, upon a potential lack-of-personal-jurisdiction -- are each provided with fourteen days from the issuance of this Order (*i.e.*, until **June 7, 2012**) in which to file a Supplemental Brief

in support of their motion. Said Brief is optional; if one is not filed, the Court will proceed to review the merits of the previously-filed dismissal motion;

2. Third-Party Defendants who did not previously move for dismissal on the grounds of personal jurisdiction are likewise granted fourteen days (*i.e.*, until **June 7, 2012**) in which to file a motion to dismiss on the basis of lack-of-personal-jurisdiction;

3. Third-Party Plaintiffs shall each have fourteen days thereafter (*i.e.*, until **June 21, 2012**) in which to file a Memorandum in Opposition;

4. Third-Party Defendants shall have seven days thereafter (*i.e.*, until **June 28, 2012**) in which to file a Reply Memorandum.

The Court expects the parties to strictly adhere to the page limitations set forth in Southern District of Ohio Local Rule 7.2(a)(3); and

5. To ensure that the Court and parties agree which entities still remain in this case, on or before **June 7, 2012**, Plaintiff(s) shall file with the Court a list of the remaining Plaintiff(s), Defendant(s)/Third-Party Plaintiff(s) and Third-Party Defendant(s). All other parties shall have fourteen days thereafter (*i.e.*, **June 21, 2012**) to file objections to said list.

The Court will consider issuing a new Scheduling Order in this case, if deemed appropriate, following its rulings on these motions to dismiss.

May 24, 2012

s/ **Michael J. Newman**  
United States Magistrate Judge